

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/540,063	06/22/2005	Peter Geigenberger	13311-00008-US	4909	
23416 CONNOLLY	7590 07/08/200 BOVE LODGE & HUT	EXAM	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 2207	7	PAGE, BRENT T			
WILMINGTO	N, DE 19899		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1638		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/08/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No. 10/540,063		Applicant(s)	
		GEIGENBERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRENT PAGE	1638	

	BRENT PAGE	1638				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 19 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>N The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date						
b) \( \) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In one event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW.						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhaunder 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any pely received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complete.	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</li> </ol>			cause			
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further core</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>		E below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	he issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sorresponding number of finding reju	otou diamito.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).			
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 45.47-61 and 63.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	tion of Annual will no	be entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
13. Other:	1.0/05/00)1 aper 140(a).					
/Anne Marie Grunberg/						

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1638

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of claim 61 under 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph for being indefinite is overcome with the current claim amendments.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants urge that there would be no motivation to combine the cited references. Harper et al teach the overexpression of SEQ ID NO.5 in plants including his promonic crops com and potato, which meets the limitation of all the method steps except the recovery or starch and/or oil from the transformed plant. Potatoes and com are well known in the art for their starch production and one of the most common uses employed in their agronomic utility the production and solation of starch. Nykiforuk is merely a representation of this normal use and is not intended to relate specifically to hemoglobin, but rather to show the very is common. The teachings by Harpwer et all establish a plant overexpressing hemoglobin which would inherently lead to the increase in starch or oil content of the plant. The normal and expected use of these crops would lead to the isolation and recovery to starch and/or oil.